

## VII. SUMMARY AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The light scatters of historic period artifacts found in the Stormwater Basin survey areas and in Wetland Replacement Area No. 2 do not appear to be associated with any discrete historic archaeological sites or architectural remains. No features or significant artifact clusters were defined as a result of the subsurface tests in these Phase I survey areas, and the isolated occurrences of prehistoric artifacts are also not considered to be significant. The artifacts recovered from Stormwater Basin No. 1 consisted only of recent historic artifacts and isolated debitage in poor contexts. From Stormwater Basin No. 2, additional isolated finds of historic period artifacts came from two shovel tests. Similarly, from Stormwater Basin No. 3, one isolated flake and two historic ceramics came from isolated locations.

A portion of Wetland Replacement Area No. 2 had previously been tested by Heite and Blume (1992) and no further work was recommended based on the results of their survey. Historic period artifacts and a few lithics were recovered from the Berger Phase I tests in Wetland Replacement Area No. 2, but no features or intact buried remains were located. Wetland Replacement Area No. 1 also had negative results. From all of these Phase I survey areas, the finds can be characterized as isolated occurrences with poor contexts. None of the findings are substantial enough to make a contribution to Delaware prehistory or history; consequently, they are not considered to be significant, nor are they considered to be eligible for the National Register.

The Ford Farm Site (7K-C-386E), where the Phase II investigations were conducted, is interpreted as a small short-term camp occupied principally during the Woodland I period, but with some evidence of an earlier occupation of probable Middle to Late Archaic age. It is likely that much of the assemblage represents marginal activities associated with the more substantial Blueberry Hill Site nearby. Blueberry Hill may have been more intensively occupied, as a result of its location close to a major stream confluence. There may also be other more intensively occupied sites further east along the bluff overlooking the St. Jones River. It is reasonable to assume that well-drained localities along the river would contain a number of such sites. Between these favored site localities would be the intermittently used sites such as Ford Farm. Such sites have intact contexts with prehistoric occupations but insufficient cultural data to generate any clear statements on the nature of the occupations.

The artifact assemblage recorded at the Ford Farm Site during the Phase II investigations exhibits considerable uniformity, which is most often an indication of a short-term occupation. Variety in artifact classes is generally attributed to camp or habitation use of a setting. This distinction is based on the assumption that the more time and/or people involved in the use of an area, the greater will be the number of activities performed. Activity variety is presumed to be reflected in artifact variety. A station type of site, representing the activities of individuals or small groups on hunting and gathering forays, is probably indicated for this location, although the fact that only a small portion of the total site area was examined may have skewed the results in favor of this interpretation.

Phase II archaeological investigations at the Ford Farm Site (7K-C-386E) provided some limited data which will contribute to an understanding of Woodland I settlement patterns and chronological themes. It also provided community pattern data regarding what appears to be a very discrete but light occupation. The lack of features and clearly defined activity areas provides little information for addressing questions of subsistence, environmental adaptations, and other key themes in Delaware prehistory. Generally, the interpretable spatial patterning on the site is confined to a single area of Woodland I (Early Woodland) artifacts in the upper horizons of the site and a more deeply buried but very sparse lithic scatter of probable Middle to Late Archaic (pre- to early Woodland I) affiliation. Given more substantial artifact recoveries in similar clear contexts, this type of site could potentially contain significant information. However, the site lacks the information necessary to contribute significantly to our understanding of basic research themes defined for the Woodland I period by Custer (1994). These themes include paleoenvironmental studies, chronology, household patterns, regional settlement patterns, subsistence systems, trade and exchange, mortuary ceremonialism, ceramic technology, and lithic technology. There is not enough substance to the data recovered from the Phase II excavations, nor is there the potential to recover such data in Phase III to address these themes, except on a very superficial level. Consequently, the site is considered to be ineligible for the National Register.